

**MINUTES OF THE  
AUBURN CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
December 15, 2009**

The regular session of the Auburn City Planning Commission was called to order on December 15, 2009 at 6:00 p.m. by Vice Chair Matt Spokely in the Council Chambers, 1225 Lincoln Way, Auburn, California.

**COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:** Snyder, Spokely, Vitas, Young & Worthington

**COMMISSIONERS ABSENT:** None

**STAFF PRESENT:** Will Wong, Community Development Director  
Reg Murray, Senior Planner  
Adrienne Graham, Planning Consultant  
Michael Colantuono, City Attorney  
Jack Warren, Public Works Director  
Mark D'Ambrogi, Fire Chief  
Lance E. Lowe, AICP, Associate Planner

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

**II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**III. ELECTION OF PLANNING COMMISSION OFFICERS**

- A. Chair**
- B. Vice Chair**
- C. Traffic Committee Representative**
- D. Traffic Committee Alternative**

Comm. Vitas **MOVED** to Elect Commissioner Spokely as Chair.

Comm. Snyder **SECONDED**.

AYES: Snyder, Spokely, Vitas, Young  
NOES: None  
ABSTAIN: None  
ABSENT: Worthington

The motion was approved.

Comm. Young **MOVED** to Elect Commissioner Snyder as Vice-Chairman.  
Comm. Vitas **SECONDED**.

AYES: Spokely, Vitas, Young,  
NOES: None  
ABSTAIN: Snyder  
ABSENT: Worthington

The motion was approved.

Comm. Vitas **MOVED** to Elect Commissioner Young as the Traffic Committee representative.

Comm. Spokely **SECONDED**.

AYES: Snyder, Spokely, Vitas  
NOES: None  
ABSTAIN: Young  
ABSENT: Worthington

The motion was approved.

Commissioner Worthington joined the meeting at 6:05 pm.

Comm. Vitas **MOVED** to Elect Comm. Spokely as the alternate Traffic Committee representative.

Comm. Young **SECONDED**.

AYES: Snyder, Spokely, Vitas, Young, Worthington  
NOES: None  
ABSTAIN: None  
ABSENT: None

The motion was approved.

Commissioner Spokely thanked Commissioner Worthington for her services as Chair and her dedication to the Auburn Planning Commission.

#### IV. PUBLIC COMMENT

Alex Fitch of 175 Shields Avenue relayed that since Cal-Trans took ownership of the Elm Avenue overcrossing at the Elm Avenue and High Street intersection, the traffic signal interval from the north bound Hwy 49 lane is two minutes long and if you were trying to make a left from High Street onto Elm Avenue and you were six cars in the queue, you might not be able to make the left turn as it is only fifteen or so seconds.

Chairman Spokely asked Public Works Director Jack Warren if control of the intersection has been relinquished to Cal-Trans. Jack Warren indicated that yes, he believes that is the case.

Commissioner Worthington also confirmed that she believes that is correct.

Commissioner Young recommended that the Traffic Committee be notified.

Chairman Spokely prefaced the Baltimore Ravine public hearing item indicating that procedurally a detailed staff presentation will be followed by questions of staff, followed by the applicant's presentation and then by public comment. Following the public comment period, Planning Commission questions and deliberation will occur. No formal action on the project will take place tonight.

Commissioner Vitas excused himself from the meeting due to a potential conflict.

Commissioner Vitas left the meeting at 6:10 pm.

## **V. PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS**

- A. BALTIMORE RAVINE SPECIFIC PLAN (BRSP)** - The City of Auburn is conducting a public hearing to provide an overview of the proposed BRSP and to take public comment on the plan. The proposed BRSP land use plan, which will be completed in two phases, provides for a total of 725 residential units, 90,000 square feet of commercial space, and 143 acres of open space. The BRSP site is located in southwest Auburn, and is generally bounded by the westbound Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) track to the south, Auburn-Folsom Road to the east, and Interstate 80 to the north and northwest. No action will be taken at this Planning Commission meeting. Additional hearings will be held in 2010 on the BRSP, the Study Areas and the associated Environmental Impact Report (EIR).

Director Wong noted that this is the first of several meetings for the Baltimore Ravine Specific Plan. The purpose of the meeting is to introduce the Baltimore Ravine Specific Plan and accept comments from the Planning Commission and public.

A subsequent meeting will be convened at the Planning Commission once the draft EIR has been circulated for the required 45 day review period. At this time, no date has been set for the public release of the draft EIR. Following the draft EIR Planning Commission hearing, staff will bring back the project to the Planning Commission for a recommendation to the City Council for the Specific Plan, EIR and Development Agreement. There will be at least two more hearings at the Planning Commission.

Director Wong stated that the subject property is designated as Urban Reserve in the Auburn General Plan. The property has been designated Urban Reserve since the 1978-79 General Plan and continued to be designated Urban Reserve in the 1993 General Plan update. The Urban Reserve designation on this property precluded development of the property until a Specific Plan was adopted. A Specific Plan has been required to assure that orderly planned development occurred in the Baltimore Ravine area.

Director Wong introduced Adrienne Graham as the City's consulting project planner for the Baltimore Ravine Specific Plan.

Planner Graham provided an overview of the Power Point presentation of the Baltimore Ravine Specific Plan which covers historical background information, a project overview, and subsequent public hearings that the Planning Commission and City Council will undertake.

The City received an application for a Specific Plan in 2007 for the Baltimore Ravine Specific Plan. The City prepared a Notice of Preparation for the project and held a public scoping meeting in 2008.

The Baltimore Ravine project was revised and resubmitted in 2009. One of the key changes is that the developer decided to eliminate developing those areas which exceeded 20% slope. As a result of this change, residential units within the plan area decreased from 1,300 to 725; commercial/mixed use space was reduced from 120,000 to 90,000 square feet; and, 143 acres of open space was proposed, which is more than half of the Specific Plan property. The age restricted component was also removed from consideration. The 2009 plan also delineated two project areas: Plan Area 1 & Plan Area 2.

The project encompasses the entirety of the Urban Reserve area, consisting of 400 acres. This includes four study areas that represent 130 acres.

In the near future, staff will present the Baltimore Ravine Specific Plan to the Planning Commission for a recommendation to the City Council, which will include the following:

- a. Adoption of the Specific Plan;
- b. General Plan Amendment;
- c. Rezoning;
- d. Certification of the EIR;
- e. Adoption of the Mitigation Monitoring Program;
- f. Large Lot Tentative Maps; and,
- g. Tree Permits.

Subsequent ministerial approvals will include:

- a. Grading Permits; and,
- b. Building Permits

Plan Area 2 will need to come back to the Planning Commission for a recommendation to the City Council for the following:

- a. Amendments to the Specific Plan to incorporate Design Standards and Development Standards;
- b. Rezoning;
- c. Development Agreement;
- d. Tentative Maps; and,
- e. Tree Permits.

Planner Graham provided an overview of Specific Plans and the components that are typically contained within Specific Plans, CEQA review and the streamlining of future development approvals.

Planner Graham further described the nine chapters and two appendices of the Baltimore Ravine Specific Plan as follows:

Chapter 1 – Describes the setting and physical character of the project and surrounding area. The plan area is heavily wooded with some grass lands at the lower elevations. The topography of the site includes some steep ravines with elevations ranging from 1,000 to 1,300 feet. The Union Pacific railroad bounds the property to the south and cuts through the middle of Plan Area 2. The UP railroad presents challenges for access and will create a separation between neighborhoods. Surrounding land uses consist of residential development to the south; low density Placer County development to the west; freeway to the north; and county development to the east.

Chapter 2 – Neighborhood Design describes the approach the Specific Plan proposes to take considering the environmental setting. The plan avoids slopes greater than 20%; uses open spaces to preserve natural resources and view sheds and also to provide separation between the planned development and surrounding uses. There is a community core that would have a park surrounded by high density development. There is also a variety of housing types ranging from 1 to 20 units per acre.

Chapter 3 – The Land Use Section includes the Land Use Plan (Exhibit 3.1) and corresponding Land Use Table (Table 3-2). The Baltimore Ravine Specific Plan includes 277 acres with 725 residential units; 90,000 square feet of commercial space; 143 acres of open space and a 2 acre park. Plan Area 1 consists of lower and medium density residential and 55 acres of open space. Plan Area 2 has the

community core with a park and mix of commercial and residential and low density residential. There is 88 acres of open space within Plan Area 2.

Chapter 4 – Addresses the provision of affordable housing in the plan. A minimum of 10% of the units in the Specific Plan will be affordable. This equates to 27 units for Plan Area 1; 45 units for Plan Area 2, for a total of 72 affordable units in the Plan.

Chapter 5 – Circulation Element – The primary street, which is a collector, would be Main Street. Main Street is a two lane road that will connect Herdal Drive to Werner Road. Several cross sections are being considered for the Herdal Drive extension.

Perry Ranch Road is being considered for secondary access. Perry Ranch Road is a private road in the county. If Plan Area 1 proceeds Plan Area 2 then Perry Ranch Road will need to be improved to meet fire department standards.

Provisions for non-vehicular circulation include bike lanes, sidewalks, and open space trails.

Chapter 6 – Public Services – The Specific Plan is not large enough to require public facilities such as a school, however, a park is provided. Also, it is likely that communication facilities will be provided in Plan Area 2.

Chapter 7 – Utilities addresses provisions for water, sewer and drainage. PCWA indicates that adequate water supply exists for the Specific Plan. The Wastewater Treatment Plant has adequate capacity provided: 1) The upgrade to the South Auburn Pump Station is completed; 2) Aeration ponds are expanded. With respect to drainage, the drainage system is designed with detention basins to ensure that drainage in the area is not exacerbated.

Chapter 8 – Biological/Cultural Resources – The Specific Plan area was surveyed except where access or topography prevented a survey. The primary habitats are pine/oak woodlands, grass lands and some wetlands. Plant surveys were conducted and special species have been identified such as Brandegee's Clarkia and one Elderberry bush. Both are located in areas delineated as open space and will be protected. The plan area also includes mine shafts which provide habitat for bats.

Cultural resources were surveyed for the Plan Area. No prehistoric resources were identified in the surveys; however, in consultation with United Auburn Indian Community, several areas of concern were identified that will be further investigated. Historic resources were identified including gold mining and the Union Pacific railroad with Bloomer Cut.

Chapter 9 – Implementation addresses implementation of the Specific Plan and the approval processes; how the plan may be amended; the transfer of residential units; phasing of infrastructure and anticipated financing mechanisms.

Appendix A – Contains the development standards which act as the zoning for the Specific Plan area. Where the development standards differ from the City's zoning ordinance, the specific plan requirements will apply. Plan Area 2 will need to incorporate additional development standards prior to being developed.

Appendix B – Contains the design guidelines which will direct the visual character and quality of the development. This section addresses streetscape, landscaping and requirements to the exterior of the homes within the Specific Plan Area.

The specific plan is available to the public at the Community Development Department, at the Auburn Library and at the City's website.

Chairman Spokely opened the Public Hearing to Planning Commissioners.

Commissioner Young had no initial comments.

Commissioner Worthington asked that Adrienne Graham explain what streamlining may occur with the Specific Plan, specifically what additional public hearing processes will occur?

Planner Graham explained that along with the Specific Plan, Zoning, a Large Lot Tentative Map and a Development Agreement will also be considered. Following these initial approvals, Small Lot Tentative Maps, Tree Permits, etc. will be required. These subsequent approvals will be presented to the Planning Commission for consideration at a publically noticed hearing.

Commissioner Worthington wanted to reiterate that the Specific Plan adoption process is a scale related approval process. Right now we are at a larger scale approval process. Subsequent public review and comment periods will be available for subdivision maps and other future entitlements.

Planner Graham also noted that future reviews will be provided for the Specific Plan, Development Agreement, EIR, and Large Lot Tentative Maps. In addition, Plan Area 2 requires subsequent approvals consisting of Large Lot Maps and other entitlements.

Commissioner Worthington questioned why the commercial core and high density residential was slated for Plan Area 2. It seems that these projects should be in Plan Area 1. Why do we have the community core and high density residential in Plan Area 2 vs. Plan Area 1? What is the nature of the plan area boundary?

Planner Graham responded that the core area for the current plan is essentially the same as the plan proposed in 2007.

Director Wong added that the applicant controls Plan Area 1 of the Specific Plan, but does not own the entirety of Plan Area 2. The City staff however required that the applicant plan for Plan Area 2. That is why Plan Area 1 is more detailed than Plan Area 2. Plan Area 2 will need more detailed approvals, such as design standards, when it is ready to be developed in the future. Staff wanted to ensure that development of Plan Area 2 was considered concurrently with Plan Area 1 development. Staff wanted the specific plan to encompass the whole of the Urban Reserve Area. Plan Area 1 is planned for development with this Specific Plan.

Commissioner Young asked whether or not Urban Reserve will pertain for Plan Area 2.

Director Wong replied that the Urban Reserve will remain for Plan Area 2, but added that the studies completed for the Specific Plan addressed Plan Area 2. Specifically, the Specific Plan and EIR included Plan Area 2 so that comprehensive planning would occur for the entire Urban Reserve area.

Director Wong clarified: Plan Area 1 may develop in accordance with the Specific Plan with approved Tentative Subdivision Maps, Tree Permits, etc. Plan Area 2 may develop pending amendment of the Specific Plan with the appropriate land use designations, zoning and design standards.

Commissioner Worthington noted that important decisions are being made by the developer with the adoption of the Specific Plan such as eliminating age restricted housing.

Director Wong stated that these modifications are being made because the developer was not able to secure the remainder of property in Plan Area 2.

Planner Graham clarified that age restricted housing may be an option in the Specific Plan.

Commissioner Worthington asked whether or not the 2 acre park will become part of the City's park inventory managed and maintained by the City?

Director Wong noted that ownership and maintenance of the park has yet to be determined. When the project comes forward in the future, that discussion will occur.

Chairman Spokely also questioned whether or not the large open spaces parcels will be dedicated to a Land Trust or other conservancy group?



Director Wong replied that the open spaces will be managed by the established Home Owner's Association for the Specific Plan Area.

Commissioner Worthington asked for clarification about the circulation for the Specific Plan.

Planner Graham discussed the proposed circulation for the Specific Plan Area. She relayed that the proposal includes a two lane road from the end of Herdal Drive through Plan Area 1 and Plan Area 2 which will eventually connect to Werner Road. A connection with Perry Ranch Road is also anticipated.

If Plan Area 1 and Plan Area 2 develop concurrently, Perry Ranch Road will be an emergency access. Alternatively, if Plan Area 1 develops by itself, Perry Ranch Road will be fully improved to provide secondary access. Development of the Perry Ranch Road is tied to the 76 building permit of the Specific Plan.

Commissioner Worthington questioned the alignment of Perry Ranch Road.

Planner Graham responded that the roadway alignment may have to be adjusted slightly, but would not require significant modification.

Commissioner Snyder asked that the Fire Chief speak to the issue of maintenance of the open space areas.

Fire Chief, Mark D'Ambrogi responded that a full fire development plan will be prepared for the property regardless of the management of the property. The Fire Department is looking at two issues: Fire protection for new development as well as keeping the existing areas safe.

Commissioner Snyder asked how many communities in the City have been approved with HOA's managing the open space areas?

Fire Chief D'Ambrogi replied that since he became Fire Chief in 2002 all developments containing more than 3 residential units have been required to have approval of a fire development plan. To date, there are approximately 19 different fire plans and HOAs. The fire development plans are incorporated into each development's CC&Rs.

Commissioner Snyder asked what enforcement mechanism do we have should the HOA not comply with the Fire Development Plan.

City Attorney Colantuono replied that the developer is required to have the CC&Rs reviewed by the City Attorney's Office prior to recording the documents. One of the provisions contained within the CC&Rs is the provision that should the HOA be remiss in their responsibility to maintain open spaces or other common areas, the

City will have the ability to conduct the work and impose assessments on the HOA to collect the costs of maintaining the property.

Chairman Spokely inquired about the history of the Urban Reserve Area and what proposals have occurred in the area?

Director Wong replied that development was restricted in the Urban Reserve Area. A Specific Plan is required for any property within the Urban Reserve area and each property has been precluded from development to assure that a comprehensive development be approved at one time.

During the 1993 General Plan update, the City decided to keep the Urban Reserve designation to allow for a comprehensive planned development of the property.

Chairman Spokely also questioned the difference between the 2007 and the 2009 plan.

Planner Graham responded that the original plan was based on densities of the entire acreage of the property, but did not take into account the slopes of the property. The new plan does not propose development on slopes over 20%.

Chairman Spokely inquired about the basis for the 20% slope requirement. Did the developer decide not to build on the steeper slopes based upon construction costs with slopes greater than 20%?

Director Wong responded that yes, considering the housing market, steeper slopes are considerably more expensive to build and the developer has decided to not build on the steeper lots within the plan area.

Commissioner Worthington said it is almost like having a hillside development ordinance.

Director Wong replied that staff hopes to take what is learned with the Specific Plan and apply that to other developments within the City. Historically, in response to steeper slope development, the City required that foundations be constructed with stem walls. However, height issues have arisen about the resulting 3 and 4 story homes.

Chairman Spokely questioned the circulation plan, particularly the Herdal Drive extension and asked about the street sections being proposed.

Planner Graham presented and discussed the street sections proposed.

Chairman Spokely recommended that the Street Sections be made available to the public.

Commissioner Worthington asked whether or not sound walls will be required.

Planner Graham responded that the EIR will address whether or not sound walls will be required.

Commissioner Worthington asked whether or not cross Section C will be used with the landscaped median similar to Roseville?

Planner Graham responded that Cross Section C will be used.

Director Wong stated that City staff is agreeable to the different cross sections being proposed. The applicant has shown the alternatives to the neighbors in the Herdal Drive area.

Chairman Spokely relayed that neighborhood consensus is a good thing as this is the primary access along Herdal Drive, but noted he was disappointed that meetings have just begun. Commissioner Spokely questioned whether or not the whole 60 foot right of way exists?

Planner Graham responded that the right of way exists and has been dedicated with prior developments in the area.

Chairman Spokely asked if the Perry Ranch Road right of way exists?

Director Wong replied that Perry Ranch Road is a private county road.

Chairman Spokely had concerns about two points of access and wanted to make sure we have the right of way prior to entitlements being authorized.

Director Wong replied that through the project conditions of approval and Development Agreement, the applicant will have to prove that all of the right of way has been obtained.

Planner Graham stated that up to 5 model homes could be constructed prior to the Herdal Drive extension. Beyond that, a connection to Perry Ranch Road would have to be completed. Prior to the issuance of 76 building permits, if Main Street is not completed up to Werner, then Perry Ranch Road will have to be improved to meet fire department standards.

Chairman Spokely requested that circulation illustrations be shown and inquired about the rail road right of way/Bloomer Cut area and how those improvements will tie into Herdal Drive.

Planner Graham presented the circulation exhibit and described how the Herdal Drive extension will be designed across the rail road right of way and Bloomer cut.

Planner Graham noted that the road grade will be elevated across Bloomer Cut and will have to comply with the Union Pacific rail road standards. The right of way is approximately 400 feet wide.

Chairman Spokely inquired about the utilities for the project. Specifically, for water, is a single water connection being proposed?

Planner Graham noted that a single point water connection is proposed.

Chairman Spokely inquired about sewage and wanted to confirm that there are three sewer lift stations proposed for the Plan Area.

Planner Graham replied that three sewer lift stations are being proposed.

Commissioner Young inquired about the Herdal Drive connection and proposed bridge and only one means of ingress/egress.

Planner Graham replied that only 5 model homes would be allowed with only one means of access. The extension of Perry Ranch Road would have to be connected prior to initiation of construction.

Stephen Des Jardins, on behalf of Baltimore Ravine Investors, 130 Diamond View Place, Roseville, CA introduced himself as the project proponent.

Baltimore Ravine development was initiated in 2006 and after many years in the process is happy to be at the Planning Commission and thanked staff for their efforts.

The Baltimore Ravine Specific Plan is designated Urban Reserve that has a base holding capacity zoning of 300 units.

Mr. Des Jardins introduced Jack Remington, Joe Olson and Chris Graves of his development team.

Mr. Des Jardins introduced the Dahlins who own property within Plan Area 2 and noted that Plan Area 2 is 135 feet lower than Plan Area 1.

Mr. Des Jardins noted that the age restricted component of the project is not entirely eliminated. However, until certain entitlements are granted and better access can be provided to the Specific Plan Area, negotiations with perspective developers have been put on hold.

Mr. Des Jardins noted that he and his team recently met with the Herdal residents and wanted to make it clear that none of the folks that he met with liked the plan or that Herdal Drive is being extended. However, the Herdal residents were happy that three road alternatives were being considered. That is why the Baltimore Ravine Specific Plan development team is happy to have a multiple meeting format in the hopes that the final plan is one that has at least responded to the Herdal neighbors' concerns. Mr. Des Jardins noted that a consensus may not be reached as a result of these meetings; however, the development team will at least try to respond to neighbors concerns.

Mr. Des Jardins noted that Perry Ranch Road is a private road. If the Perry Ranch Road right of way cannot be obtained, Plan Area 2 will provide a secondary access. The Dahlins own Plan Area 2 and have shown a commitment in participating in the development of Plan Area 2. If a bridge is constructed across Bloomer Cut and extends Herdal Drive, there is a willing landowner who would be able to develop and extend the road through Plan Area 2.

The development team was very mindful that the City desired a hillside development ordinance. The goal of the BRSP is not to provide large homes on steep lots, but to provide housing on slopes less than 20% that are appropriate for the Auburn market. The development team was also receptive to comments from the Sierra Club that was in opposition of "Vulture Housing." That is, larger houses that are constructed on a ridge and cantilever over the hillside. Also with respect to roads, Public Works does not like to approve roads in excess of 15% slope.

When you look at the old plan vs. the new plan, the buffers are much greater in the new plan. As an example, greater buffers have been established along the 400 foot Union Pacific rail road right of way. Within the rail road right of way, there are a tremendous number of trees. As a result, views from existing developments such as Grand Oaks are buffered.

Commissioner Young asked about Perry Ranch Road.

Director Wong responded that if the developer proceeds with the extension of Main Street, Plan Area 2 will likely be presented for approval. It would be unlikely that the developer would construct the entirety of the infrastructure without having Plan Area 2 approved.

Mr. Des Jardins said that from a practical standpoint the developer would want Plan Area 2 approved. Timeframes for infrastructure improvements permitting are so extensive, that negotiations are still yet to be resolved. However, what we do know at this time is that the Dahlins are willing to provide the necessary access through Plan Area 2. Ultimately, both bridges will need to be constructed for access to the Specific Plan Area.

Commissioner Worthington noted that the circulation issues are the critical path for the development and has concerns with the lack of specificity on how these access issues will be resolved.

Mr. Des Jardins replied that access is not unconfirmed and that a plan to provide access is achievable. Herdal is under the control of the City. Plan Area 1 is owned by me and Plan Area 2 is owned by the Dahlin's who have shown a willingness to develop.

Mr. Des Jardins further explained the plan for access.

Commissioner Worthington thanked Stephen Des Jardins for clarification on the circulation plan and asked whether or not discussions have been occurred with Cal-Trans?

Planner Graham replied that the circulation section of the EIR will address impacts to freeways.

Mr. Des Jardins noted that the traffic engineer will also be present when the EIR is under review to provide a more thorough response to any circulation issues.

Chairman Spokely asked about the overall design theme of the Specific Plan.

Mr. Des Jardins replied that the development team desires to work with the materials and history of the property. For example, when you walk through Bloomer Cut, you can see the history of the geology of the area within the layers of cobble, ash and volcanic mud. Because the cobbles are encased within these geologic formations, you would want to construct using cobble materials. We would also like to incorporate the rail road theme.

Chairman Spokely closed the public hearing for a brief recess.

Chairman Spokely reconvened the meeting and thanked members of the public for their attendance and directed members of the public to direct their comments to the Commission.

James and Kim Dahlin of 590 Rodgers Lane introduced themselves and stated for the record that they are owners in Plan Area 2 and are interested in developing the property. They have indicated that they have had several interested developers looking at their property. If Stephen Des Jardins does have an issue regarding access, they are agreeable to working with Stephen Des Jardins or another developer.

Dennis Andrews of 897 Supreme Court said that he has spoken with several neighbors and has concerns about the increase in traffic on Auburn Folsom. In

particular, Mr. Andrews has concerns about congestion, safety and noise. At present there are homes on Auburn Folsom that have no sound walls.

Alex Fisch of 175 Shields Avenue has some concerns about the project and to what end the project benefits the City? Mr. Fisch questioned the financing of the Specific Plan and wants to ensure that the City will not be burdened with providing the backbone infrastructure. Mr. Fisch recommended that the developer be required to pay for all the infrastructure. Mr. Fisch also had concerns regarding access to Plan Area 1. It does not appear that adequate right of way widths are available along Herdal Drive. Lastly, Plan Area 2 contains high density residential which does not appear to be viable; it is not located near schools, jobs, or transit. Typically, high density residential should be located next to urban services. Similarly, commercial development proposed within Plan Area 2 may not be viable considering that the commercial will only serve the Specific Plan area.

Melanie Barton of 101 Maple Street raised concerns about the historic and cultural resources of the area. The proposed site is one of the most significant sites in relation to the Trans Continental Railroad and is eligible for the National Registry of Historic Sites.

Commissioner Worthington asked when these types of questions will be addressed?

Planner Graham noted that many of the comments will be addressed in the EIR.

Chairman Spokely also noted that a separate Planning Commission meeting will be convened on the EIR.

Michael Emmert of 10640 Oak View Terrace, representing himself and over half the residents along Herdal Drive, has concerns about the Herdal Drive extension. Herdal Drive is the only access to their development. There are 23 homeowners that back onto or face Herdal Drive that will be impacted. It is his understanding that this development will increase the existing traffic on Herdal by over 350%. The 76 homeowners within Oak View Terrace attended a meeting with Mr. Des Jardins to better understand what the Baltimore Ravine Specific Plan entails and what impacts it will have on the neighboring Herdal Drive residents.

Mr. Emmert noted that in February 2008 the neighboring residents were asked to attend a meeting to discuss the Baltimore Ravine Specific Plan. At the time we were asked to put any comments and/or concerns in writing. Substantive comments were presented to the City. In April of 2009, we were informed that the project had changed and we were once again informed to submit comments and/or concerns in writing. To date, no comments have been addressed, but we have been told that the draft EIR would be forthcoming in 2010. In late October 2009, the City posted on its web site the Baltimore Ravine Specific Plan and noted that the applicant listed in

the application was Baltimore Ravine, LLC. Who is the applicant of the Baltimore Ravine Specific Plan? What is their track record?

Mr. Emmert also noted that as he read the Specific Plan there appeared to be very little specifics. Mr. Emmert also had a concern that the Specific Plan is out, yet, the draft EIR is months from being completed, which raises more questions than provides answers. Over the coming months we intend to dig more deeply into the proposal and agreements, proposals, and documents so that we are better informed about the project.

Bart Ruud of 843 Sierra View Circle has concern of the livability of Auburn. Mr. Ruud also expressed concerns that the City is working on a project when the General Plan is over 17 years old. It would seem that we need to rethink how the City of Auburn is developing. Mr. Ruud also expressed concern with the impacts that the development will have on Auburn. Mr. Ruud believes that the development should pay its own way so that existing residents do not have to pay additional fees. Mr. Ruud relayed that he submitted some 85 questions regarding the project, but has not received any answers to date.

Andy Helms of 11080 Oak View Terrace addressed the Commission and noted that the town needs to grow. The City of Auburn is lacking housing and needs to grow to be sustainable. Auburn is a very community oriented town and the Planning Commission needs to work with the community on how this area develops.

Haas Aozorgzae of 2730 Circle Play Drive has lived in Auburn 11 years and used to live in the Bay Area. Prior to moving to Auburn, Mr. Aozorgzae looked at several other communities, but chose Auburn as his home. In the last 10-12 years, Mr. Aozorgzae has been involved in real estate and acknowledges that development and change will occur in the City of Auburn. Mr. Aozorgzae was very happy to hear that the developer was responding to citizen comments; development limitations of the property; and, would work with the community.

Gena Wiskus of 10930 Oak View Terrace relayed that she lived next to Bloomer Cut. Ms. Wiskus has concerns about the increased traffic on Herdal Drive and the impacts that would occur to residents that live near Herdal Drive.

Mr. Des Jardins concluded that he believed it was a very good first hearing on a process that has just begun. Mr. Des Jardins looks forward to subsequent meetings to discuss these issues. When the EIR is circulated it will hopefully answer a number of questions.

Commissioner Worthington requested that the developer take a copy of the names of persons who spoke tonight.



Mr. Des Jardins requested that residents give their personal contact information to city staff to be contacted for future meetings.

Chairman Spokely closed the public hearing and asked if the commissioners had additional questions.

Commissioner Young thanked the residents for their time and comments and noted that access to the project site will be of critical concern to him.

Commissioner Worthington would like to schedule a tour of the property.

Commission Snyder would also like to schedule a tour of the property. Commissioner Snyder would like to have the tour be a noticed public meeting so that all Commissioners could tour the property at the same time.

Director Wong replied that his preference is to have the Planning Commissioners tour the property individually. If a quorum is present, a noticed public hearing will be required.

Commissioner Snyder would like to have the Commissioner's together at one meeting as Commission dialogue is helpful for each other.

Commissioner Worthington added that perhaps a video of the tour could be taken.

Director Wong noted that there are pros and cons in having a noticed public hearing on site. This decision should not be made tonight.

Commissioner Snyder agreed.

Chairman Spokely turned the meeting over to Will Wong.

Director Wong reiterated that anyone wishing to receive a public hearing notice, please contact staff and a public hearing notice will be forwarded to you.

Director Wong also noted that the next meeting will be on the draft EIR; however, no meeting date has been set.

## **VI. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 8:47 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lance E. Lowe, AICP  
Associate Planner